



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/717,249

11/19/2003

Martin Evans

CAT/009

7746

75160

7590

10/30/2008

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP / INTERCAT EQUIPMENT
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SUITE 100
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

BOYER, RANDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ktaboada@pattersonsheridan.com
PSdocketing@pattersonsheridan.com
tchowdhury@intercatinc.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/717,249	Applicant(s) EVANS, MARTIN	
	Examiner RANDY BOYER	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Randy Boyer. (3) Keith Taboada.

(2) Tanzina Chowdhury. (4) Martin Evans.

Date of Interview: 20 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Discussion relevant to all claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Andon (US 4,082,513).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorneys argued the persuasiveness of the Evans declaration to overcome the obviousness rejections of Applicant's claims. Applicant's attorneys proposed possible amendments to the claims to further distinguish Applicant's claims from the disclosure of Andon. No agreement was reached with respect to the patentability of any of the pending claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

RPB	/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797
-----	--